



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

an

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/926,177	01/07/2002	Wolfgang Gunter Ruckmann	W1.1641PCT-US	1623

7590 04/10/2003

Douglas R Hanscom
Jones Tullar & Cooper
PO Box 2266 Eads Station
Arlington, VA 22202

EXAMINER

TRAN, LOUIS B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3721	

DATE MAILED: 04/10/2003

9

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

NK

Office Action Summary

Application No. 09/926,177	Applicant(s) RUCKMANN ET AL.	
Examiner Louis B Tran	Art Unit 3721	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 February 2003.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.
- 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 9-15 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-15 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 9-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 - 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
 - * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
 - a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 3.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant's election with traverse of claims 9-12 in Paper No. 8 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that both invention are directed to a longitudinal folding device. This is not found persuasive because the inventions fulfill the lack of unity requirement. Applicant has questioned examiners use of the term "blocking". This is a typographical error is was meant to state "locking" as used to described applicants invention of folding throughout the specification. The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.
2. Claims 13-15 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.
4. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 9, the phrase "shell-like" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "- like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 9-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Pflaum (DE 2754179 A1) in view of Breton et al. (5,030,193).

With respect to claim 9, Pflaum discloses the invention substantially as claimed including a longitudinal folding hopper having at least first and second hopper flanks, said hopper flanks receiving paper webs seen in Figure 4, a machine frame supporting a paper deflection device 2,3, a high voltage source connected to said paper deflection device, said paper deflection device being arranged electrically insulated against said machine frame seen in Figure 1 and 2, wherein the longitudinal folding hopper has a hopper projection seen in Figure 4 (as in claim 11), first and second hopper folding rollers 18,19, said hopper folding rollers being rotatably supported by and electrically insulated from said machine as in Figure 2 (as in claim 12).

However, Breton et al. teaches the use of a paper deflection device enclosing said longitudinal folding device in a shell manner seen in Figures 16-18 for the purpose of creating a more efficient high speed folding machine as in column 1, lines 45-50.

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to provide Pflaum with a shell deflection device in order to increase fold efficiency.

With respect to claim 10, Pflaum discloses wherein the said high voltage source is high tension source having different polarities and further wherein said longitudinal folding hopper and said paper deflection device are connected to different polarities of said high tension source.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide DC or AC current since the examiner takes Official Notice of the equivalence of DC and AC current for their use in the web joining art and the selection of any of these known equivalents to charge a web or paper would be within the level of ordinary skill in the art.

Conclusion

7. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure are Whitten, Maylander et al., Buxton, Kobler, Ogura et al., and Sjostrom.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Louis B Tran whose telephone number is 703-305-0611. The examiner can normally be reached on 8AM-6PM Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rinaldi I Rada can be reached on 703-308-2187. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9302 for regular communications and 703-872-9303 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 3721

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1148.

lbt
March 31, 2003

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Rinaldi Rada", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Rinaldi I. Rada
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Group 3700